

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing (day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference F03-06056591
--

FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
--

International application No. PCT/JP2004/012584	International filing date (day/month/year) 25.08.2004	Priority date (day/month/year) 04.09.2003
---	---	---

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant KONICA MINOLTA PHOTO IMAGING, INC.
--

<p>1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <div style="margin-left: 20px;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I Basis of the opinion <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. II Priority <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI Certain documents cited <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application </div> <p>2. FURTHER ACTION</p> <p>If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.</p> <p>If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.</p> <p>For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.</p> <p>3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.</p>

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/012584

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/012584

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

☐ the entire international application

☒ claims Nos. 1-3

because:

☒ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. 1-3

relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

Claims 1-3 are merely a disclosure of information, which is related to a scope that does not require International Primary Search.

☐ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. _____ are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

☐ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. _____

☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form

☐ has not been furnished

☐ does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form

☐ has not been furnished

☐ does not comply with the standard

☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

☐ See Supplemental Box for further details.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/012584

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>4-9</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	_____	YES
	Claims	<u>4-9</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>4-9</u>	YES
	Claims	_____	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Document 1: JP 11-234607 A (Minolta Co., Ltd.)
27 August 1999, Par. Nos. 0003-0008, 0079
(Family: None)

Document 2: JP 2001-57056 A (Ricoh Co., Ltd.)
27 February 2001, Par. Nos. 0002-0008
(Family: None)

The inventions of claims 4-9 do not appear to involve an inventive step over document 1 and document 2 cited in the ISR.

Par. No. 0079 of document 1 describes a technology, in accordance with which transfer of image data obtained by an image capture device, such as a digital camera, to a second recording medium (a magneto-optical disk, etc.) is accompanied by conducting processing on the image capture device side using the ID of the second recording medium serving as the destination of the transfer.

In addition, Par. Nos. 0006-0008 of document 2 describe a technology, in accordance with which, during recording of data from a digital camera on a different recording medium, folder classification is carried out using classification categories designated by the user and attribute information such as information concerning the type of equipment used, etc., and data that share the same classification categories are stored in the corresponding folders.

Because both the technology described in document 1 and the technology described in document 2 are intended for recording data from a digital camera on another recording medium, combining the two would be easy for a person skilled in the art.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2004/012584

Box No. VIII **Certain observations on the international application**

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Because the disclosure provided within the meaning of PCT Article 5 with regard to the technical feature described by the language "specific information used for making an assessment as to whether or not to create image data management folders with names in accordance with a predetermined rule" in claims 1 and 7 consists only in a technology for making a determination as to whether or not an information recording medium is permitted for writing image data (specification, page 11, line 21 to next page, line 2, page 17, lines 15 to 19) with the help of "information used for making an assessment as to whether or not a recording medium is authorized for writing image data" (specification, page 8, line 11 to line 20), claims 1 and 7 lack support within the meaning of PCT Article 6.